

SIR JADUNATH SARKAR

ASHIRBADI LAL SRIVASTAVA

A Chapter of
Historians and Historiography
In Modern India

1976

Institute of Historical Studies

CALCUTTA

First published in June 1973
Reprinted in 1976

© Institute of Historical Studies 1973

Published by Dr. S. P. Sen
Director, Institute of Historical Studies
35 Theatre Road, Calcutta 17 (India)

Price : Rs. 100 (India)
U.S. \$ 25.00 or its equivalent in any other
foreign currency

PDF created by Rajeshkumar Gambhava

Printed in India by Pradip Kumar Chatterjee
at The Eton Press Private Ltd., 43 Aurobindo Sarani, Calcutta 5

SIR JADUNATH SARKAR

DR. A. L. SRIVASTAVA

(Agra University)

JADUNATH was born on December 10, 1870, at the village of Karachmaria in the Rajshahi district of Bengal, now in Bangladesh. He was the third son of Rajkumar Sarkar and his wife Harisundari, both of whom were sincerely religious and much above the average in ability and character. Rajkumar had inherited a big zamindari and was a well-to-do and enlightened landlord. Jadunath, brought up in rural surroundings, was a healthy child and an exceptionally brilliant student. He received his early education at his village, next at Rajshahi and finally at Presidency College, Calcutta. He passed all his classes with credit and took double Honours in English and History in 1891, and in 1892 he passed the M. A. Examination of Calcutta University in English Literature, standing First in the First Class, securing high marks and beating all previous records in the subject. He obtained 90, 92 and 95 per cent marks in three papers,¹ and a little less in other papers. He was awarded a government scholarship for higher studies in England, but he declined the offer, and decided to work for Calcutta University's Premchand Roychand Scholarship which was considered the most coveted prize by scholars of merit. In June 1893, he was appointed a lecturer in English at Ripon College, Calcutta, and was asked to lecture to the Fourth Year class, which consisted of extremely unmanageable grown-up youths. The students took him to be a first year boy, but when he quietly entered the class and started teaching "the whole class sat mute, as if spell-bound. When they recovered from their surprise, a whisper passed around that he was no other than the intellectual prodigy, Jadunath Sarkar, the wonder and envy of the student community and the favourite pupil of Percival."² After three years Jadunath was appointed Professor of English at Vidyasagar College and worked there for two years. In 1897 he was awarded the coveted P.R.S. and was selected for the Provincial Educational Service in June 1898. His first appointment in that cadre was as Professor of English at Presidency College, Calcutta, where he served for one year. He was then transferred to Patna College where he served from July 1899 to June, 1901. He returned to Presidency College for six months, and was posted back at Patna College at the urgent request of its Principal, C. R. Wilson. Meanwhile, he had published his first work of research, entitled *India of Aurangzib* (1901), which established his fame as a first-rate researcher and historian. He had taught English Literature for several years, and now he was shifted to the Department of

History in Patna College. He served there up to 1917. That year his services were borrowed by Banaras Hindu University where he served as Professor of History for two years (1917-19). In 1918 he was promoted to the Indian Educational Service, and was posted as Professor of History and English Literature at Ravenshaw College, Cuttack, in July 1919. In October, 1923 he was again transferred to Patna from where he retired in 1926. He was a model of punctuality and regularity in meeting his classes. Nevertheless, his students felt sure that on the last day of his service as Professor he would not lecture to them. But Jadunath "took every class to the last minute with unperturbed composure and without any reference to his retirement...." When his farewell party was over, he returned home and heaved a sigh of relief at being free from the bondage of service. He said, "What a relief from the trouble of dressing and undressing for office from tomorrow! I felt teaching not one-tenth as exacting as the ever-present anxiety for punctual attendance and the botheration of dressing under compulsion."³ Before retiring from professorship, he was nominated as Vice-Chancellor of Calcutta University, which office he held for two years, from 1926 to 1928. He declined a second term, because Vice-Chancellorship was a hindrance to his first love—historical research. In 1929 he was conferred a Knighthood. Lady Sarkar asked: "I hear that you have become something. Is it true?" He replied in good humour: "Yes, from today people will call you Lady Sarkar."⁴ Sir Jadunath Sarkar had already been honoured with the title of C.I.E. in 1926.

Jadunath Sarkar's distinctive literary achievements received ample recognition in India and in foreign countries. It is, however, amusing to note that the Indian learned societies honoured the historian some three years after the celebrated Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain had recognised his eminent services to Indian history. Then the Royal Asiatic Society of Bombay awarded him the Campbell Gold Medal in 1926, and conferred upon him an honorary fellowship. The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal also made him an honorary fellow in the same year. But three years before, in 1923, he had already been elected as an honorary member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, an honour bestowed on not more than thirty scholars in the whole world.⁵ The Royal Historical Society of England also appointed him an honorary corresponding member of that Society in 1935. This Society did not have more than thirty honorary corresponding members in the world.⁶ The American Historical Society of Washington also appointed him its honorary life member. It may be noted that he was in his day the only Asian scholar who was thus honoured by these learned foreign societies.

At the time of leaving the portals of the Calcutta University in 1892 Jadunath was a master of English and Sanskrit. Soon after he began preparing himself assiduously for a historian's career by acquiring a sound

knowledge of Persian and Marathi. He gradually learnt Rajasthani, Hindi, French, German and Portuguese, too. As regards Persian, he cultivated the practice of reading its *shikast* mode of writing, for without it, it was not possible to decipher documents written in that style. He discovered and collected numerous important Persian manuscripts in India, England, France, Portugal and Germany, and had their transcripts made at a great expense from the famous European libraries and from those in Delhi, Rampur, Lahore, Hyderabad, Patna and other former centres of Islamic learning in India. The result of the close study of these original sources was his P.R.S. thesis, entitled *India of Aurangzib, Its Topography, Statistics and Roads*, published in 1901. This scholarly work had taken him nine years (1892-1901) to produce. Thereafter he wrote and published five volumes on the *History of Aurangzib*, which involved full twenty-four years' labour. Side by side with his study of Aurangzib, he worked on Maratha history and produced a remarkably good volume on *Shivaji and His Times*. He then took up the work of writing a comprehensive account of the downfall of the Mughal empire in four volumes. The last volume of this series was published in 1950. The great historian's last gift was his *Military History of India*, published in 1960, nearly one and a half years after his death. The following is a list of Sir Jadunath Sarkar's works:⁷

1. *India of Aurangzib, Its Topography, Statistics and Roads*, 1901. 2. *Economics of British India*, 1909. 3. *History of Aurangzib*, vol. I, July, 1912; vol. II, July, 1912; vol. III, July, 1916; vol. IV, 1919; vol. V, December, 1924. 4. *Anecdotes of Aurangzib and Historical Essays*, 1912. 5. *Chaitanya: His Pilgrimages and Teachings*, 1913 (Its second edition entitled *Chaitanya's Life and Teachings*, 1922). 6. *Shivaji and His Times*, 1919. 7. *Studies in Mughal India*, 1919. 8. *Mughal Administration* (in three parts—1st series, 1920; 2nd series, 1925). The combined volume was published in 1925. 9. *Later Mughals* by W. Irvine, edited and continued by Jadunath Sarkar with three chapters added by him, vols. I and II, 1922. 10. *India Through the Ages*, 1928. 11. *Short History of Aurangzib*, 1930. 12. *Bihar and Orissa during the Fall of the Mughal Empire*, 1932. 13. *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. I, 1932; vol. II, 1934; vol. III, 1938; vol. IV, 1950. 14. *Studies in Aurangzib's Reign*, 1933. 15. *Massir-i-Alamgiri*, edited and translated into English, 1949. 16. *Poona Residency Correspondence* (edited), vol. I, 1930; vol. VIII, 1945; vol. XIV, 1949. 17. *House of Shivaji*, 1940. 18. *Ain-i-Akbari* (edited), vol. III, English translation by Jarrett, 1948; vol. II, 1950. 19. *Persian Records of Maratha History*, translated into English, vol. I: *Poona Matters from Delhi*; vol. II: *Mahadaji Scindhia as Regent of Delhi*. 20. *Dacca University History of Bengal*, vol. II (edited and wrote 10½ chapters besides the bibliography). 21. *Nawabs of Bengal* (Sir William Jones Bicentenary Series, no. 1, The Asiatic Society, Calcutta). 22. *Aurangzib* (Hindi edition). 23. *Shivaji* (Hindi edition). 24. *History of Dasnami Sect*, vols. I-II—both English and Hindi. 25. *Military History of India*, 1960.

Besides the above works, almost all of which have gone into more than one edition, Jadunath Sarkar contributed four chapters to the *Cambridge History of India*, vol. IV, as many as sixty original papers to the *Modern Review*, a number to the *Bengal Past and Present*, and numerous papers to the *Proceedings of the Indian Historical Records Commission*. He wrote some thirty-five papers on historical topics for the weekly edition of the *Hindusthan Standard* of Calcutta, and many other articles for various other journals and magazines. He contributed Forewords to not less than eleven works of other scholars.⁸

Sir Jadunath was an equally good and prolific writer in Bengali and wrote numerous articles in that language, which are too many to be enumerated in this short notice.⁹

It is not generally known that on the completion of his student career in the University, Jadunath Sarkar had a mind to carry on research in Modern Indian history and had selected the Indian Mutiny of 1857 as his subject. He had consequently collected more than a hundred printed works, most of them contemporary, on that subject. The writer of this paper was once deputed to find out a certain Marathi work on Indian Ephemerics in his library at Patna and he counted a large number of books on the Mutiny in that library. So he enquired of Sir Jadunath Sarkar, when he met him next at Darjeeling in 1934, as to why he had in his library many dozens of books on the Mutiny. The historian replied that he had once an idea of writing on the Indian Mutiny, but had realised soon after that it was not possible in the 19th century to do full justice to that topic. It was perhaps for this reason that he chose to work on the Mughal period, and selected Aurangzib as his topic.

India of Aurangzib (1901) is not a history properly so called. It is primarily an account of the physical aspect of India in the second half of the 17th century. Though based on a critical study of many contemporary authorities in Persian, the most important work on which Jadunath relied in writing that book was Rai Chhatraman's *Chahar-i-Gulshan*, written in 1759. This unpublished Persian work gives an extremely useful account of topography and other details of the Mughal provinces, and the history of religious sects in the 17th and the first half of the 18th centuries in India. After writing *India of Aurangzib* Jadunath naturally turned to the history proper of Aurangzib, the first volume of which he devoted to a very critical account of the reign of Shahjahan, and the early career of Aurangzib as prince and governor, one after another, of several provinces. The second volume gives a graphic and critical account of the war of succession and the causes of Aurangzib's success. The third deals with the early measures of the reign and gives a critical analysis of the principles and policies of Aurangzib's administration and the Islamic Church State in India. The fourth volume describes the Deccan affairs and the subjugation of the states of Bijapur and Golkonda and of the fall and tragic death of Shambhaji.

The last volume carries the story of Aurangzib's unsuccessful Maratha policy to his death and the disorder and confusion in Northern India during that emperor's twenty-five-year long absence. The book ends with the historian's summing up of Aurangzib's character and the impact of his long reign on India's fortunes.

While engaged in writing his history of Aurangzib, Jadunath was brought face to face with Shivaji, the former's most formidable adversary, and this made him study Maratha history as deeply as that of the Mughals. His *Shivaji and His Times*, published in 1919, created a stir in Maharashtra as his third volume of Aurangzib had done in Muslim circles in the country. It showed that the Maratha hero, despite his spectacular success, had failed to build a nation, and that most of his institutions were not quite original. These assertions were damaging to the reputation of the nationalist historians' theories as well as to the hero himself and caused resentment in Poona. The historian remained undisturbed and continued working on the last volume of Aurangzib and editing William Irvine's *Later Mughals*, vols. I and II, and adding three chapters on Nadir Shah's invasion to the vol. II of this work. Years before he had translated Hamid-ud-din's *Ahkam-i-Alamgiri* under the title of *Anecdotes of Aurangzib* which gives an insight into that ruler's character as no other contemporary work does, and completed his *Essays*, which consisted of ten charming essays, important among which were those on the daily life of Shah Jahan and Aurangzib.

Before undertaking his second great project, namely, the downfall of the Mughal empire, he completed three small but very valuable works, namely, the *Mughal Administration* (a pioneer work on the subject), *India Through the Ages* (a very successful erudite account describing the distinctive contributions of the Aryans, the Buddhists, the Mughals and the British to the making of Indian civilisation) and *Studies in Mughal India* which consisted of twenty-two brilliantly written essays, ten of which had already appeared in the *Historical Essays*.

The first volume of the *Fall of the Mughal Empire* commences with India after Nadir Shah's departure in 1739 and the problems before Muhammad Shah, and comes down to the end of Emperor Ahmad Shah's reign in June 1754. The second volume begins with the accession of Alamgir II (June 2, 1754) and ends with Shah Alam II's return to Delhi from his exile under the tutelage of the English East India Company, on January 6, 1771. The third volume starts with the tasks before Delhi government in 1772 and comes down to the atrocities committed by Ghulam Qadir Rohilla on Shah Alam and the Rohilla's murder on 4th March, 1789. The last volume ends with the conquest of Delhi and Agra by the British in 1803. The last chapter of the volume gives the author's reflections on the passing of the old order and the ushering in of the new age. While occupied with these monumental volumes, Jadunath yet snatched time for writing yet another work on Maratha history, namely,

the *House of Shivaji* which, being a scientific study of the personalities and documents of the 17th-century Maratha history, is invaluable for research scholars. During the same period he published his *Studies in Aurangzib's Reign* consisting of eighteen historical essays, and his English translation of the *Maasir-i-Alamgiri*.

The *Military History of India* published in 1960 after the historian's death (May 1958) is a study of the development of the art of war in India, as illustrated in some of the notable battles fought on her soil. The work begins with a significant chapter on how geography dictates strategy, and consists of twenty other chapters and two appendices.

It is worthwhile to say a word about Jadunath Sarkar's methodology of research. Before he started working on the history of Aurangzib in the last decade of the 19th century, a researcher was considered to have done well, if he could utilise one or two, and exceptionally well, if only just a few contemporary chronicles, in producing his work of research. Hardly did any scholar of Medieval Indian history think of collecting all available contemporary sources in various languages on his subject, and none knew that there was anything beyond the court chronicles in Persian. Historical letters, diaries, court bulletins, and news-letters were unknown. Jadunath was the first scholar to insist on getting all original contemporary source-material in various languages ready to hand. He did not content himself with chronicles written by court historians and other writers. He made an exhaustive search of memoirs, court bulletins and historical letters written by participators in the events of their times and sometimes by contemporary gifted observers. He collected hundreds of news-letters, particularly those in Persian, known as the *Akhbarat-i-Darbar-i-Mulla*, and letters in Marathi written by Maratha agents not only in the Deccan but in all parts of Northern India. For all this it was necessary to acquire a very good knowledge of Persian, Marathi and Rajasthani which Sir Jadunath Sarkar did at the cost of a good deal of his time and money. He did not neglect French and Portuguese and acquired historical material in the contemporary writings in those languages. A thorough search and acquisition of all contemporary material in all the languages concerned with the period of his research was, in his eyes, the first indispensable preliminary for the researcher.

Jadunath Sarkar did not take the writers of chronicles and other works of court historians or other writers and even of historical letters at their face value. He subjected the text of each contemporary work to a scientific scrutiny for ascertaining their authenticity or otherwise by making use of the modern method of textual criticism. Thus he tried to separate the wheat from the chaff, and mercilessly exposed the gossip and what he called the opium-eater's tale in Marathi *bakhars* and Rajasthani historical verse and prose compositions. From his long experience of

handling historical manuscripts, he could at once discover whether a Persian manuscript was a faked one, and which part of a particular work was based on plagiarism. Such a scrutiny for establishing the text of each manuscript beyond controversy constituted the next indispensable necessity in the eyes of Jadunath Sarkar. After this he would translate all the material into English, study it with care, and then write his conclusions.

It was Sir Jadunath Sarkar's habit not to depend entirely on written records. He would visit the historical sites connected with the subject of his study, in order to acquaint himself with their topography and terrain, and other details and see the life of the common people in all parts of India with his own eyes and have an insight into their character. With these objects in view Jadunath paid numerous visits to Maharashtra, spent months in the company of the people, inspected every fort, valley and scene of battle of the Mughal age.¹⁰ He visited all parts of India including the places of religious importance, not as a devotee but as a scholar, keen to have insight into the religious and communal life of the people. We find in his writing a vivid description of the topography of important places connected with his studies, the scenes of battles, military manoeuvres and of guerrilla tactics of the Marathas. Sir Jadunath not only displayed meticulous care and thoroughness in the collection and study of the source material, but he showed even greater care in the testing of evidence and in trying to discover the truth in a maze of contradictory records. There was no room for hesitation or vacillation in Jadunath Sarkar's mental make-up, and there remained no doubt or confusion at the touch of his merciless logic. He did not suffer from the common human failing of consideration for country, race, religion, family and the like. His works are characterised by unity of conception, of theme and presentation, by direct and easy flowing language and a charming style so that his reader's interest hardly ever flags. He bestowed a good deal of attention and care on his style which is free from cant, verbosity, indirectness and affectation. He told the present writer once, while talking of the historian's style, that at the age of 80 he usually condensed four pages of his composition into one.

The historian Jadunath had his own conception of intelligibility and purpose in history. Although he recognised the fact that intelligibility in history is inherent in the historical process itself, yet he did not altogether brush aside the medieval idea that attributed causality in history to divine intervention. He believed in human destiny; but destiny meant to him character. For example, writing about the fate that overtook Shah Alam II (1759-1806), he says: "No man can rise above destiny as the wise of ancient days have truly said. Destiny is only another name for character, and Shah Alam's character alone was responsible for the fate that now

long decay of the age-old Muslim rule in India, and the utter failure of the last Hindu attempt at empire-building by the new-sprung Marathas... must be studied with an accuracy of details as to facts and penetrating analysis as to causes if we wish to find out the true solutions of the problems of modern India and avoid pitfalls of the past."²⁰

"The light of our fathers' experience is indispensably necessary in guiding aright the steps of those who would rule the destinies of our people in the present."²¹ At another place he says: "History when rightly read is a justification of Providence, the revelation of a great purpose fulfilled in time."²² True history is an "object-lesson to the people for all ages to come."

Some of Sir Jadunath Sarkar's sentences have become almost proverbial and passed into the idiom of the language. For example, he writes: (1) "A nation's greatest enemy is within, not without"; (2) "War is the supreme test of a nation's efficiency"; (3) "Nana Fadnis saw the things of Delhi Empire through his ears"; (4) "Civil war, as a test for the survival of the fittest to rule, was barred by the British bayonets"; etc.

Dr. K. R. Qanungo is of the opinion that "he [Jadunath] has all through his works revealed himself as a 'sage, counsellor and judge'." He again says, "If Jadunath is anything today he is the stern prophet of Free India in his writings and speeches."²³

The historian Jadunath had a host of critics, some of whom were sincere and others openly hostile. But hardly did any one think of challenging the factual background of any of his numerous writings, and none dared charge him with deliberately distorting facts, omitting those that he did not like or glossing over inconvenient ones. This was because Jadunath had never been guilty of any distortion of facts and of the mistakes of omission and commission. There have been just two or three honest points of criticism regarding facts or their interpretation, and these contend that (i) in his assessment of Aurangzib's religious policy he (Sarkar) did not take notice of that emperor's Banaras *farman*, making a grant of land to the Vishwanath temple, (ii) that his interpretation of the *jazia* is not fair, and that (iii) in the absence of decisive evidence it is unfair to say that Shivaji's murder of Afzal Khan was a 'preventive murder'. The critics were silenced when it was brought home to them that (i) Aurangzib issued the *farman* in question during the war of succession when he was keen to seek the Hindu support in capturing Shuja, and it had nothing to do with his so-called desire to patronise Hindu religious institutions; (ii) that the historian did not offer his own interpretation of the *jazia*, but only summed up the "agreed judgements" of the contemporary Muslim jurists and, therefore, it is ludicrous to attempt "to exonerate Aurangzib and Islam in the same breath"; and (iii) that Afzal Khan was guilty of gripping Shivaji and striking the first blow on the Maratha king with his belt-dagger is clearly attested by Mir Alam, the famous

overwhelmed him and his house."¹¹ He also believed in divine justice. Writing about the punishment given to Shah Alam's Nazir, Manzoor Ali, who assisted the ruffian Ghulam Qadir Rohilla in the latter's insulting the aged emperor, he says: "One almost feels a grim satisfaction that divine justice did not sleep over the prime cause of these princely sufferings, the arch-traitor Nazir Manzoor Ali." A fine of seven lakhs was imposed upon him and he "then was beaten, dragged into a latrine and threatened with having his mouth stuffed with excrement unless he paid it."¹² Similarly, the historian speaks of divine retribution¹³ when Ghulam Qadir was captured and put to death by the orders of Mahadaji Sindhia, and when his eyes were taken out of their sockets and presented to Shah Alam. Jadunath Sarkar also believed that an invisible, inscrutable and inexorable force guides human destiny and that force too was, in his eyes, synonymous with the total effect of the human action. Very often he uses 'Fate' in the sense of divine justice or divine retribution. A few examples will make the point clear. Aurangzib's strenuous reign of fifty years was, in his view, the story of a man "battling in vain against an invisible, but inexorable fate," and, therefore, it "ends in colossal failure."¹⁴ Describing Shivaji's escape from Agra he writes: "The credit of his escape from the claws of the faithless tyrant rests solely with him, even when we concede that in so far as not a single mishap marred it at any stage, a friendly Fate must have helped the lion-hearted man of action."¹⁵ The historian equated fate with the effects of human action when he says: "The seeds that had been sown in the third stage of his [Aurangzib's] life, unnoticed and in ignorance of their fruits, began to sprout up in the fourth, and he had to gather their baneful harvest in the fifth and closing periods of his life."¹⁶

Sir Jadunath believed in inevitability in history due to the operation of certain forces of the age. That is why he wrote with regard to Aurangzib's failure that "the strongest human endeavour was baffled by the forces of the age."¹⁷ Again, he says that "slowly but pitilessly his 'Fate' works itself out, finally defeating all his efforts, though the invisible cause of his failure lay in his character and past deeds. Slowly but with increasing clearness does the tragic plot unfold itself till Aurangzib realises the true nature of the forces arrayed against him and the real trend of affairs... and he retires to Ahamadnagar only when the first summons of death reaches him."¹⁸ Jadunath Sarkar also believed in divine mercy. For example, describing the condition of India after Nadir Shah's departure, he says, "Heaven seems to have taken pity on the sorely afflicted people of Northern India. In the next season there was adequate and timely rainfall, the earth yielded a profuse harvest and all foodstuff became cheap and plentiful, as if to make amends for the people's recent sufferings.... Nature is not half so much the cause of a nation's misery as Man."¹⁹

Like other great scholars and sages, Sir Jadunath was of opinion that history had a lesson for all of us. For example, he writes: "The head-

long decay of the age-old Muslim rule in India, and the utter failure of the last Hindu attempt at empire-building by the new-sprung Marathas... must be studied with an accuracy of details as to facts and penetrating analysis as to causes if we wish to find out the true solutions of the problems of modern India and avoid pitfalls of the past."²⁰

"The light of our fathers' experience is indispensably necessary in guiding aright the steps of those who would rule the destinies of our people in the present."²¹ At another place he says: "History when rightly read is a justification of Providence, the revelation of a great purpose fulfilled in time."²² True history is an "object-lesson to the people for all ages to come."

Some of Sir Jadunath Sarkar's sentences have become almost proverbial and passed into the idiom of the language. For example, he writes: (1) "A nation's greatest enemy is within, not without"; (2) "War is the supreme test of a nation's efficiency"; (3) "Nana Fadnis saw the things of Delhi Empire through his ears"; (4) "Civil war, as a test for the survival of the fittest to rule, was barred by the British bayonets"; etc.

Dr. K. R. Qanungo is of the opinion that "he [Jadunath] has all through his works revealed himself as a 'sage, counsellor and judge'." He again says, "If Jadunath is anything today he is the stern prophet of Free India in his writings and speeches."²³

The historian Jadunath had a host of critics, some of whom were sincere and others openly hostile. But hardly did any one think of challenging the factual background of any of his numerous writings, and none dared charge him with deliberately distorting facts, omitting those that he did not like or glossing over inconvenient ones. This was because Jadunath had never been guilty of any distortion of facts and of the mistakes of omission and commission. There have been just two or three honest points of criticism regarding facts or their interpretation, and these contend that (i) in his assessment of Aurangzib's religious policy he (Sarkar) did not take notice of that emperor's Banaras *farman*, making a grant of land to the Vishwanath temple, (ii) that his interpretation of the *jazia* is not fair, and that (iii) in the absence of decisive evidence it is unfair to say that Shivaji's murder of Afzal Khan was a 'preventive murder'. The critics were silenced when it was brought home to them that (i) Aurangzib issued the *farman* in question during the war of succession when he was keen to seek the Hindu support in capturing Shuja, and it had nothing to do with his so-called desire to patronise Hindu religious institutions; (ii) that the historian did not offer his own interpretation of the *jazia*, but only summed up the "agreed judgements" of the contemporary Muslim jurists and, therefore, it is ludicrous to attempt "to exonerate Aurangzib and Islam in the same breath"; and (iii) that Afzal Khan was guilty of gripping Shivaji and striking the first blow on the Maratha king with his belt-dagger is clearly attested by Mir Alam, the famous

wazir of Nizam-ul-mulk of Ahmadnagar who was also a historian.

Apart from these few instances there has been a good deal of vague and often uninformed criticism of the historian in certain circles in Calcutta and a few other places in Bengal, in Maharashtra and at Allahabad and Aligarh. The Bengal criticism was short-lived, as it had little to do with him as a historian. It questioned his knowledge of Persian and even of English. It was due to personal reasons and to party-politics in the Calcutta University. The Maharashtra criticism was the resentment caused by his intrusion into Maratha history, his merciless exposure of the comparative unreliability of the Marathi sources like the *Bakhars* and his incisive criticism of the new-fangled theories of the patriotic school of Maratha historians. The so-called Allahabad school of medieval Indian history, torn between 'academic rectitude' and 'civic duty', blames Jadunath for not omitting offensive details of temple destruction and putting down of Hinduisim by force from his works. It feels that the mere mention of such facts of history is repugnant to Muslim feelings and drives a wedge between the two communities. Aligarh which looks upon medieval Indian history as its special preserve is naturally sore with the historian for his graphic and incontrovertible details of Aurangzib's anti-Hindu policy in particular and the failure of Muslim rule in India in general, and charges him with bias against Islam and the Muslim community. This charge may be dismissed as a make-believe. Sir Jadunath's impartiality is attested to by Dr. C. C. Davis of Oxford who wrote, while reviewing his *Fall of the Mughal Empire* (vol. I), that the readers of his account of the atrocities committed by Maratha raiders in Northern India would agree that the belief held in certain quarters that Sir Jadunath was biased against the Muslim rulers of medieval India was groundless.

It is curious to note how some of these very critics of the historian treasure Sir Jadunath's appreciative words about themselves and repeat them on important occasions. Dr. Tara Chand, a great pillar of the Allahabad school of Medieval Indian history and probably the author of the theory of "civic duty" versus "academic rectitude", recalled with pleasure at the annual session of the Indian Historical Records Commission at Chandigarh in 1961 Jadunath Sarkar's remark when he was informed that the learned Doctor had been entrusted with the project of writing a history of the Freedom Movement in India. The historian was reported to have said: "It [the project] has been entrusted to competent hands." Dr. Ishwari Prasad told the writer of this article times without number that when he called on the great historian during his visit to Allahabad in 1943 or 1944 Sir Jadunath said, "Come in, Dr. Ishwari Prasad, you are a genuine scholar." Professor K. A. Nizami of Aligarh has quoted with approval Sir Jadunath's estimate of Najib-ud-daula's character as a general and strategist and as a statesman. Many such examples can be easily multiplied. But these few given above are enough to show that honest differences apart,

Jadunath's conclusions and opinions could not be lightly disregarded.

Sir Jadunath was unquestionably the greatest Indian historian of his time and one of the greatest in the world. Naturally, therefore, his powerful personality and erudite works could not fail to exert great influence on contemporary scholars and historians. There was hardly any sensitive and honest worker in the field of medieval Indian history who could remain immune from this healthy influence in some way or other, directly or indirectly. Such scholars may be divided into three groups, namely, (i) those who sought his help and guidance and came directly into personal contact with him; (ii) those who had no opportunity to meet him, but derived benefit from his numerous books of research and therefore felt indebted to him; and (iii) finally those who found fault with him and yet did not fail to be impressed by his extraordinary scholarship and unconsciously followed his example and his methodology. In short, most workers, if not all, in the field of medieval Indian history felt indebted to Sir Jadunath Sarkar, whether they had come into contact with him or not and whether they were his disciples or friends or critics. Among his direct pupils and the latter's pupils there were some privileged ones like Dr. K. R. Qanungo and the writer of this paper who lived under his roof and enjoyed his hospitality and had the supreme good luck of coming into close personal contact with the historian and receiving the benefit of his guidance. In their works is reflected the master's methodology and research technique, namely, the use of all available contemporary material in the original, meticulous care in collecting and sifting evidence and presenting their theme in direct and plain style. Then there were those—and their number was larger—who were permitted, like Professor Shri Ram Sharma, Dr. Hari Ram Gupta, Dr. S. N. Rao and others, to make use of his library at his residence and share with him afternoon tea and sometimes breakfast too, but who made their own lodging and boarding arrangements. But these too had the privilege of the master's guidance and their historical writings reveal the pattern set by Sir Jadunath Sarkar—honest and thorough research. A still larger group of workers received his help and guidance through correspondence in the form of suggesting suitable topics for research, giving an outline synopsis and supplying a list of original authorities in manuscript and print and modern works to be read. There was yet another group, the largest of all, of distant scholars who drew inspiration from the historian's published works and consciously or unconsciously imitated his historical methodology and his style and manner of presentation.

It is not known to many that a very healthy influence of Sir Jadunath on his immediate students—researchers and historians of recognised merit—was the fear that if they slackened in their effort in the cause of historical research and gave up the pursuit after taking the doctorate degree, they would lose the guru's goodwill. Hence they would continue working even after having neared or reached their retirement on account of superan-

uation. His personal example of regular hard work, abstemious living and making full use of his time, though very difficult to be imitated, served as a living ideal for many who had the aspiration to walk in his footsteps.

Nor has his influence died with his death. It is likely to continue to exert itself for a long time to come, for Sir Jadunath became, perhaps unintentionally, the father of a new school of medieval Indian historiography in the real sense. This school is functioning without the master. The main planks on which this school stands are: (i) the necessity of a sound knowledge of all the contemporary languages of medieval India, besides Sanskrit, English, Portuguese, Dutch and French; (ii) a meticulous search and collection of all original contemporary source-material to be found in the above languages; (iii) a scientific study of this material in the original; (iv) sifting of evidence as carefully and impartially as may be humanly possible; and (v) presenting the conclusions in a sober and scholarly style. This school does not believe in sacrificing 'academic rectitude' at the altar of 'civic duty'. 'Civic duty', important though it is, comes in only in the matter of presentation of facts and interpretation in temperate and balanced language and in the avoidance of excitement and passion.

This school also believes that, like its founder, every member must be constantly on the lookout for fresh material on his special subject or period, and must revise his work or works in the light of that fresh material in the second and subsequent editions. Knowledge is not static. One must keep in constant touch with the ever-growing knowledge of one's subject.

REFERENCES

1. Sardesai, "Jadunath Sarkar as I know him" in the *Life and Letters of Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, edited by H. R. Gupta, vol. I, p. 26.
2. Dr. K. R. Qanungo, "Jadunath Sarkar" in the *Life and Letters*, vol. I, pp. 41-42.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
5. Dr. H. R. Gupta, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
7. B. N. Bose, *Ibid.*, pp. 108-09.
8. *Ibid.*, pp. 110-13.
9. Jogesh Chandra Bagal, *Ibid.*, pp. 114-25.
10. Sardesai, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.
11. *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. III (First ed.), p. 446.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 455-56.
13. *Ibid.*

14. *Aurangzib*, vol. V, p. 1.
15. *Shivaji*, 5th ed., pp. 140, 150.
16. *Aurangzib*, vol. V, p. 3.
17. *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 1.
18. *Ibid.*, vol. V, p. 3.
19. *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. I, p. 3.
20. *Ibid.*, vol. I, 2nd. ed., p. iii.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Aurangzib*, vol. V, p. 495.
23. *The Life and Letters of Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, vol. I, p. 71.

PDF created by Rajeshkumar Gambhava